ADDRESS

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION, Held at Syracuse Jan. 10. 1856.

Their Opinion on Democracy, Republicanism and Temperance.

Prilow-Citizens: We address you in the name of the Democratic party. Our reflections, uniting with the experience of the past, have satisfied us that the prepenty of the country depends upon the permanent ascendancy of Democratic principles. Whether we are right in this you must judge. If not, we have erred with some of the wiscat patriots and statesmen that ever lived. We are far from claiming that the Democratic party has never gone astray, or that all good men have adopted its faith. Good men have sometimes opposed it, but we think from mistaken views; and bad men have sometimes joined it under a like delusion. What we claim for it is that its political creed is in harmony with the true spirit of our institutions, and that it cannot fail in upholding them while it keeps near the light of its own principles. We invite your attention to some considerations on this subject.

them while it keeps near the light of its own principles. We invite your attention to some considerations on this subject.

The Democratic party was designed merely as a means of influencing the course of public or governmental affairs, by the concentrated action of politice opinion; leaving all other matters to the free and unbiased choice of the citizen. It was not organized, as some of its former professed friends seem to have assumed, to keep watch and ward over the entire domain of taste and sentiment, thought and duty; or to act as a spy upon the private opinions or pursuits of men, or sit in judgment upon their consciences, or control even their outward conduct, except through the rightful action of Government. These are heresies of modern growth, entirely alien to the principles for which the illustrious detenders of our faith, with Jefferson at their head, steadfastly contended in former years. Their objects were purely governmental in their nature; and their political creed, though broad enough to reach every subject of Governmental concern, extended no further. On other subjects, where Government could not or should not act, their creed was either silent or spoke only to admonash us of the duty of forbearance, and the danger of interfering. It was fashioned, indeed, with most wise and cautious reference to the true principles of regulated liberty; proteribing no one for the opinions he held, the altar at which he worshiped, or the place where he was born; and countenancing no tyranny over him in any of his private relations. For it was the creed of men who, with arms in their hands, had just rebuked the nurighteous intermeddling of one usurper, and feared that another might succeed; men who had read history, and knew how surely this cell spirit of tyrannical encroachment lurks in the shadow of power; and how it destroys the energy of the citizen, wastes the springs of public action, and eradicates from whole communities the virtues of self-dependence, courage, and patriotism. If the past has left any

of every people who have been compelled to submit for centuries to minute Police regulations, until they ceased to rely, not only on themselves, but almost on Providence; and looked listlessly to Government as the fountain of morals, religion, right, and duty. Its importance is attested by all those limitations upon Gevernmental action so carefully prescribed in our written Constitutions; and the Democratic creed, in view of the never-ceasing tendencies of power to ealarge itself, warms us that unslumbering, may, "eternal "vigilance, is the price of liberty."

The disregard of these admonitorry lessons, gleaned from bitter experience of the past, has betrayed many into erroneous views of the true objects of political association, and the apporpriate functions of Government; views harmless enough while they remain mere speculations of the closet, but which are found eminently mischievous in practice. Without adverting at present to other illustrations, let us turn for a moment to the course which some wow invite us to take with regard to the subject of domestic Slavery. More than once during the period of our national existence, the efforts of men professing unbounded sympathy for the slave, to induce Government to act in furtherance of their theories, forgetful of every other object of political association, have given just cause for serious alarm. And recently, may within the last few months, other men, with lond professions of Democracy on their time with lond professions of Democracy on their time with their hearts are for from it, have banded alarm. And recently, may within the last few months, other men, with lond professions of Democracy on their lips, while their hearts are far from it, have banded themselves for renewed and more formidable efforts to evoke the spirit of Abolitionism, withfall the gloomy passions which wait on it. This last organization was deemed so important by its authors and abetters as to call for the instant abandonment of every other political creed, and its advent was accordingly ushered in by a formal resolution, announcing that the Whig and Democratic parties were to exist no longer: that henceforward there were to be no more Whigs and Democrats, but that all were to be Anti-Siavery Republicans. Nor was the surprise exceted by this announcement at all dimmished when we were told in effect afterward, by the Chief Captain of the new forces thus mustered against the peace of the Union, that the owners of slaves were to be treated as an edious "aristocracy" which "in the peace of the Union, that the owners of slaves were to be trented as an odious "aristocracy" which "in "every case and throughout all hazards, should be "abhorred and avoided:" that the interests of the North and South were therefore directly and irreconcilably antagonistic; that the citizens of these differ-ent sections of our common country could no longer dwell together in unity; that the compromises of the Constitution were a bollow truce which had been kept Constitution were a bollow truce which had been kept too long; that Congress must be arged to set them at defiance, and assume uncompromising, aggressive, Anti-Slavery ground; and that every other effort of Government must be autordinated to this, and every other test of political faith at once abandoned. And to remove all doubt from our minds as to the temper and resolution with which the warfare was to be waged, we were told a little later, through the columns of a leading paper devoted to the cause, that the South was about to be called into fearful account; not for commerce, but for reagrence,"

South was about to be called into fearful account: not "for commerce, but for vengcance."

When we consider that these avowals were made in the name of what now claims to be a great party, and that they were not uttered in the heat of blood, but prepared for the public eye after consultation and delibetion, they invest the subject with a solemn and startling interest, and may well excite gloomy fore-bodings as to the future. The time is come, fellow-citizens, when the ground on which we stand should be carefully examined, and the course we are to take in the coming struggle clearly delineated and understood.

Without pausing to inquire here whether Congress has power to act in accordance with the views of this new sect—a question which admits of no answer but an unhesitating negative, if we rightly appreciate the tendency of their doctrines—we pass to the mere practical and broader inquiry whether it ought to alopt them? Let us give these men the benefit of their disclaimers. Let us admit that they do not propose to interfere with Slavery now in either of the old thirteen States; that they intend no insult to their brethren of those States, while branding them as objects of Governmental distrust and abborrence; that they are athirst for peace and tranquillity, while lavoking the demons of discord and strife; that they venerate the Union, while denouncing the wisdom which framed it as "treason against Human Rights:" and that they hope to perpetuate its blessings by joining hands with them who hate and curse it and pray for its overthrow. Grant that all of them do not see the tendency of their actions or the inevitable end of their career, and that they are doing this evil with a vague expectation that some possible good may come at last. Still, the question is not what they intend or ultimately expect, but Without pausing to inquire here whether Congresome possible good may come at last. Still, the ques-tion is not what they intend or ultimately expect, but what course should others take whose sense of duty is yet unsubdued by the frenzy of fanaticism or the last of power! Is it wise, is it just, is it right in any con-civable view—nay, is it not both absurd and cruminal—to countenance the theories which now, for the first time in our national history, this motley throng of poli-ticians claims shall be accorded. as claims shall be enforced, "in every case and oughout all hazards," by direct Governmental as-

tion?
We have assumed that they are not yet so far gone We have assumed that they are not yet so far gone in delusion as to meditate any present assault upon Slavery in the old thirteen States; though even this is but at inference, perhaps an unwarranted one, from their silence. In the strange document called their "platform of principles," drawn up by a professed Abolitionist, and unanimously adopted as the permanent basis of their organization, we find the following distinct avowals, which show how wide a field of agretation they mean ultimately to occupy, and how little they are disposed to restrict it out of deference to the Constitution:

they are disposed to restrict if out of descrence to the Constitution:

"Resolved. That the Federal Government, being one of desined and limited you can be accounted to establish, upboile or between Shavey in any portion of the public demain, or to censure at its examine in the Federal Territory by any means whatever.

"Resolved. That since there can be no been Shavey in the Territories of our Union, there can be no been Shavey in the Territories of our Union, there can be no been states legally formed out of such Territories, So.

The powers of the general Government in respect to Slavery are the same to-day that they were when the Union was formed, and if they have not been exceeded heretofore by the admission of Shave States, they cannot be hereafter. In other words, if Congress has no power to admit new Slave States now, as these theories broadly affirm, it has had none at any time, and every act of that nature, whether past, or future, may be treated as a mere usurpation, not obligatory upon any one. Suppose the cardinal doctrine inculented by the resolutions we have quoted to be adopted as an ciescental perion of our national policy, and to have

become what their authors mean they shall be—"the "creed of political faith, the text of civic instruction, "the touchstone by which to try the services of those "we trust"—at once the prompfer and the guide of individual duty and public action. Everything hitherto done under which new Slave States have been formed out of territory once constituting part of the public domain must then be deemed unconstitutional, and therefore absolutely invalid for any practical end. Louisians. Missouri, and all other States received into the Union, in violation of the dogma on which alone resistance for the future is to be based, have none of the rights of Seates under the Confederacy! If they are considered members of it for any purpose, they hold their position by suffrance only; not in virtue of the Constitution! They are not entitled to be represented in the councils of the nation, nor to have its aid in suppressing domestic insurrection, or in repelling foreign invasion; and every faithful believer in this new creed is bound to say so by his votes, in Congress and out of it! Indeed, we are told that they have not a "Republican form of Government;" that they are uncongenial, and therefore unfit, associates for the Free States; that they are mere "Aristocracies." which "in every case and throughout all hazards "must be abhorred and avoided;" and so they should be thrust from the Union, or compelled to change their domestic policy! Such, fellow-citizens, are some of the teachings of Anti-Slavery-Republicanism. Such the broad and dismal field of agitation which it opens to our view, and on which it urges Government to enter.

The problem of domestic Slavery was one of the most difficult which the framers of the Federal Constitution bad to solve. The institution then existed in nearly all the States, including New-York, and was deeply interwoven with the social habits and industrial pursuits of our people. It had been fastened upon us by the coercive policy of the mother country, undeviatingly and perseveringly pursued through And no one, we believe, will say so, who truly reveres the Constitution, and meditates no assault, now or hereafter, on its beneficent adjustments and wise som-

The Anti-Slavery Republican party, however, invites us to aid in giving ascendancy to men who have said and do say so, and who strive to make their dogmas the foundation of governmental action, as well as the test and limit of political faith. Men who, had they stood by when Washington and his computriots finished tileir labers, and given utterance to their present views, would have denounced the Constitution as a "covenant of blood!" They admit that it tolerates Slavery, and that, while it provides for the return of fugitive slaves, it is impressively silent as to the admission of new Slave States, and imposes no express duty to interfere with the subject anywhere or in any form. They admit, indeed, that it treats Slavery as an affair of local sovereignty, which the people of each of the original States at least may deal with as they please, irrespective of the views and wishes of the people of other States. And though they rail against its compromises, they admit, too—for they cannot falsify history—that the Union could not have existed if their spirit, isstead of the spirit of peace, had prevailed. No one, moreover, will probably deny that had some prophet rent the vail of the future, and revealed the time when Congress was to act in accordance with the new theories now proposed, every Southern State would have refused to join the Confederacy. And suppose even that the power to enforce these theories could be found in some ambignous clause of the Contitution, and that, if exercised, an astate legal philologist might be able to maintain it. Still, the question is not one of law alone, nor of philology, nor metaphysics; but of The Anti-Slavery Republican party, however, inbe able to maintain it. Still, the question is not one of law alone, nor of philology, nor metaphysics; but of practical statesmanship, of wise governmental expedi-ency, of good faith, honesty and fair dealing. And we put it to you as such, and ask you again, ought the power to be exercised?

cncy, of good faith, honesty and rair dealing. And we put it to you as such, and ask you again, ought the power to be exercised?

Conceded power in Government is not always to be put in requisition; doubtful power, never. What a lawyer tells us we can do, is not an uncring test of human conduct even in the most inconsiderable affairs of private life; but other considerations frequently remain to control the course of duty. This is peculiarly so in public affairs as to matters where the Government is left free to act or forbear. Many formidable powers which Congress possesses by universal consent have been wisely suffered to remain in repose; for example, its power over domestic commence, and in respect to bankruptcy. On these and other subjects it has studied forbearance as the true policy of Government, seldom obtruding on the field of local sovereignty, even when as power to do so was undoubted, except in accordance with some supposed and imperious public exigency, and then retiring as soon as the exigency ceased. The principle should be extended to every case where Federal power may be safely dispensed with, especially if the right to interpose it is seriously doubted by intelligent men, and bad consequences are likely to flow from its exercise.

Nothing is clearer, fellow-citizens, than that the policy of Anti-Slavery Republicanism, if prosecuted in the reckless spirit which has thus far characterized it, will lead to consequences which no one can contemplate without dismay. Other exercises of congressive

it, will lead to consequences which no one can contemplate without dismay. Other exercises of congressional power as to Slavery have shown some respect to constitutional limits, to the prevailing temper and exigencies of the times, and to the issues of good or evil likely to result. Whether they were prompted by one metive or another is a question of no moment now, except with those who hope to rise and prosper by turbulent and irrelevant appeals to more prejudice and passion. These and all other measures should be judged to-day, as they will be in after-times, by their practical adaptation to the just ends of government, and their tendency to secure the peace and well-being practical adaptation to the just ends of government, and their tendency to secure the peace and well-being of the country. Whatever else may be said of them, they were not animated by that spirit, which, repudiating the constitutional definition of a "republican form of Government," and vanuting its indifference to the fate of the Union, denounces the citizens of one section of it as the special objects of governmental "abhorrence," and asserts that the North and South are not the natural enemies of each other? It was not so with the act called the Missouri Compromise, which was the result of most anxious, patient and patriotic endeavors to harmonize conflicting views and allay for the time the frenzy of sectional strife. Nor with its repeal, which assumed to banish the spirit of discord from the council chambers of the nation, by limiting the range of Federal action, and enlarging the domain of local sovereignty. The temper and policy of Anti-Slavery Republicanism, however, is far different. It abhors conciliation. It disdains peace, It calls back the spirit of discord. It will have nothing to do with local sovereignty of any kind, and least of all with that which looks for its warrant to the consent or choice of the people. It invokes the arm of the Nation, and prosteries the corresponding war-war without truce or reof discord. It will have nothing to do with local sovereignty of any kind, and least of all with that which looks for its warrant to the consent or choice of the people. It invokes the arm of the Nation, and proclaims Congressional war—war without truce or relenting, and, for aught we see, war without end! And so sublimated are its theories that its adherents cannot advance one argument for their adoption, founded on the plain principles of the Constitution; nor any argument indeed, except such as proves, if it proves anything, that Slavery should be assailed everywhere, and at all times, in spite of constitutions and compacts. We invite you to consider not merely the outward form of their cresd, but its inner life and irrepressible practical tendencies. They ask for Congressional in tervention on the assumed ground that slaveholding, under all circumstances, is absolutely incompatible with religion, as well as with republican principles: so much so, indeed, that Government cannot innecently let it alone! And when told that the Constitution was fashioned upon a different theory, they admit and lament the fact, exait themselves above the Constitution, above the Government, and appeal to a "higher law!" The light by which our fathers walked and tolled will not do for them. They seek the pure empyrean! In the language of Mr. Webster, they are "above confinences."

They pant for absolute perfection and will countenance nothing which falls short of it! Ou other subjects of public experiment, and appears the resulting experiments and will countenance nothing which falls short of it! Ou other subjects of public experiment and subjects of tables experiment and experiment described experiments. gange of Mr. Webster, they are "above ordinances." They pant for absolute perfection and will countenance nothing which falls short of it! On other subjects of public concern, however, they are modest in their pretensions: peaceable like other men, and far less exacting. They believe in governmental jobs, and steamships, and high tariffs, and lavish expenditures, and mortgage of revenue, and vast public debts, and all the franculent contrivances by which the few are enabled to prosper at the expense of the many. These they can countenance and tolerate—nay lobby for, advocate and practice—nothwithstanding all their specious cant about dury, and human rights and governmental perfection! They economize in their zeal for public parity and would coaffine its benefits wholly to the colored race?

Congress is one of the mere agents of Government.

the colored race I
Congress is one of the mere agents of Government.
Its powers are derived from the Constitution, and it
has no right to act upon theories which that instrument repudiates, whether they are good or bad.
Every attempt thus far to extend its control over the
subject of Slavery, however guarded and conciliatory,
has been fraught with danger. Angry sectional controversies, alienated feeling, enfeebled patriotism,
have uniformly resulted from such measures. And if
this new experiment upon the public tranquillity shall
thrive, and all the powers of Government be surrend-

ered to Anti-Slavery Republicanism, who can tell what the future has in store for us? When enc-half the people of the Union shall be taught to curse it as irreligious and Anti-Republican, and the other half to denounce it as a fraud on their rights, an open enemy to their State policy, their interest and their homes, who shall answer for its fate? An act of Congress passed one year may be repealed the next. You may call it a compact if you please, and declare it irrepealable; but this will not change its nature. And so the passage of every act will be only the signal high for a new mustering of heatile forces, agitation succeeding agitation with increased intensity, until every tie of fracernal feeling shall be utterly destroyed, and the blind instinct of sectional hate take the place of patriotism. Grant even that the Union is strong enough to survive the struggles of our day and generation to which this line of policy invites us. What will it be to them who shall succeed us but a heritage of endless discord, or at best, a worthless memorial of blessings won by heroism and lost by foily. And even for ourselves—for the interest of those now living—is it nothing to have the nation smitten with an incurable disease; to waste it with perpetual fever, or rack it with convulsions? Will it prove to us an efficient protector while struggling against coming death, its strength emaciated, and its functions all perverted? We are no alarmists, and are as little disposed to inspire you with unmanly fears, as to be shaken by them ourselves. The dangers of which we speak are not undefined shadows, floating in the far-off horizon of the future. They are substantial things—objects of sense—and we must deal with them. Washington saw them more than half a century ago, and in the last colemn act of his public life, warred his countrymen against them. They have alarmed the patriotism of latter times, and in 1839 a stateman of New York, now gone to his rest, but whose loss at this criss is more deeply deplored than ever, addressed

is more deeply deplored than ever, addressed his fel-low-citizens on the subject.

[Here follow two extracts from Silas Wright and

Gen. Jackson.]
Let us heed these impressive lessons of patriotism, Let us heed these impressive lessons of patriotism, and oppose those who invite us to engage with them in this new Anti-Slavery crusade. Reject with abhor-rence the treasonable fallacy that sectional strife is either wise, patriotic or necessary. Leave the people of the Territories to settle their own policy in regard to Slavery. Extend to them every needed protection for the free and fair exercise of their choice, but go no further. All rational men concede—even Anti-Slavery Republicanism hesitates to deny—that when they are admitted as States, their right to establish or abolish the institution will become perfect, and no power on earth can question their decision. If they are admitted to-day with an Anti-Slavery Constitution, they may change it to-morrow without consulting our wishes; and should Congress attempt to prevent their doing so, it would be an invasion of sovereignty, which might and should Congress attempt to prevent their doing so, it would be an invasion of sovereignty, which might be lawfully resisted by force of arms. Or should they come into the Union with a Constitution which prescribes no line of policy on this satisfiest, but leaves it to be settled by State legislation afterward, the result will be the same. And so they will have their own way at last as we have had ours. Why not then abstain at once from all intermediding, and stop useless agitation? We believe the people are thred of it, and desire peace. It promises no good—none whatever, but only evil, and that continually—evil in our national councils, in the different States, in churches, and everywhere. Other and direr forms of evil will follow, if we persist in urging Congress to act evil will follow, if we persist in urging Congress to ac on theories at war alike with the Constitution and com on theories at war alike with the Constitution and common sense. Can we not afford to rely on the unwritten but steady laws of population in the disposition of questions of this kind? Have we traveled so far away from Democracy that we dare not trust the people of the Territories with the management of any of their own affairs? Is no faith to be placed in the instincts and interests of intelligent men, or in anything except the coercive powers of Government? Or do we really believe that all good must come to us, if at all, through acts of Congress; and that duties have no existence or validity until prescribed by statute? This is the creed of Anti-Slavery Republicanism—not of the Democratic party.

We have forborne to speak of a third class of mer We have forborne to speak of a third class of men who have been misled into false views of the nature and true office of government. We mean those who, within the last year or two, organized themselves into a political party to enforce the single virtue of Temperance, leaving the other virtues to shift for themselves. After urging our State Legislature to disregard the Constitution by passing a law in violation of it—a law the authorship of which none of its followers are willing to avow—it has quietly subsided, along with the waning remnant of the old Abolition party, into the ranks of Anti-Slavery Republicanism. Both will be remembered hereafter for their good intentions, their bad deeds, and their ignoble end.

THE SOFTS "EATING DIRT" AT SYRA-CUSE.

From The N. Y. Dady News.
The men who went to Buffalo in 1848, and then and The men who went to Buffalo in 1848, and then and there resolved to support the renegade. Van Buren for President, and to "fight on, fight ever" for their platform, "no Slave Territories and no more Slave States"—these same traitors, with certain accessories after the fact, have been in session for two days at Syraeuse, trying to cover up all their past infidelities, and to swallow down all that they rejected a few years since. So potent is the force of official patronage and Presidential recognition, that the same fellows who declared "the Democratic party for ever dissolved," because they could not, under Polk, control all the Federal appointments in this State, are now solemnly resolving that "they are the only Democratic party," because, under Pierce, they do control all the Federal appointments. What a farce is this whole affair—what a miserable, disgusting, infamous, and degrading position do not these dirtecters occupy! Men who stood up a few years ago, declaring before the world that they had at last awakened to the recognition of a great principle—that negro Slavery was the bane and the curse and the damning stain branded upon the American people—that their especial political mission was hereafter to labor that it be restricted, circumscribed, and hemmed in—that to the end that "their unalterable hostility to the extension" of Slavery into territory now free" might be accomplished, they would never again support a slaveholder for effice—that all political questions were secondary for effice—that all political questions were secondary "of Slavery into territory now free" might be accomplished, they would never again support a slaveholder for effice—that all political questions were secondary and unimportant compared with this—that Cass, because he opposed their Proviso, was unworthy of their support—that Dickinson, who voted for Texas annexation and for the Compromise measures, should be "ear-"ried back toold Virginia," and rejected and contemned by the "Free Democracy of the North"—here are these same men, for the sake of miscrable offices, and in the hope of retaining them, groveling in the dut, recarding their professions, acknowledging themselves hypocrites hope of retaining them, groveling in the dust, recarding their professions, acknowledging themselves hypocrites and pretenders, pleading recent conversion, and sickening all beholders with a newly-assumed cant of nationality and patriotism! If any such spectacle of vensity has been witnessed before, since politics began among men—if any such bold, loathsome and degrading exhibition has been made—we are among these who have never read or heard of it. The sly laugh with which those arrant knaves, the Roman angurs, are said to have greeted each other when they met, was nothing to the broad grins with which the members said to have greeted each other when they met, was nothing to the broad grins with which the members of this congregation of officials must have come together at Syracuse. Many of them had not met since Joshna R. Giddings, Erastus D. Culver, Benjamin F. Butler, the negro Ward, the Rev. J. W. May, Stephen C. Phillips, David Dudley Field, Israel T. Hatch and Charles Francis Adams addressed them with their "fellow-traitors" at the Buffalo Convention is the Convention of the Conv with their "fellow-traitors" at the Buffalo Convention in 1848. Others remembered that they had acted together in the Utica Convention of that year, along with Henry S. Randall, James W. Nye and George Rathbun, when John Van Buren reported the resolutions. The memory of others recurred back to the Herkimer Convention of 1847, where John P. Beckman and Churchill C. Cambreleng figured, and where David Wilmot denounced Hunkerism and the South. And there were many who recollected the Anti-Texas Secret Circular of 1844, signed by Bryant, Edmonds, T. W. Tucker and the rest. Let us hope they had an agreeable sort of time in recalling these "by-gence!" Among the members of this Convention of January 10, 1856, we notice the names of Henry H. Van Dyck Among the members of this Convention of January
10, 1856, we notice the names of Henry II. Van Dyck
and Nicholas Hill of Albany; Oliver C. Crocker of
Broome; Gilbert Dean of Dutchess; Ferael T. Hatch
of Erie: Dean Richmond of Genesse; J. C. Campbell of Mouroe; George H. Purser, Hiram EngleJohn Cochrane, &c., of New York; William Vandervoort of Niagara; Noble S. Elderkin of St. Lawrence;
William H. Ludlow of Suffolk; Pomeroy Tucker of
Wayne, and others of lesser note, who, in 1848, were
rampant Abolitionists and supported the most ultra Abolitionists for office! Everybody knowathis. Does anybody believe that these men have changed their views!

body believe that these men have changed their views. Will they, themselves, admit that they have individe ally changed their views? Will all the resolutions the can pass make the world believe that their real opinion. can pass make the word believe that their real opinions—
if they have any at all—are not now just about what
they were eight years since? Can anybedy, then
truly and honestly conside in what they now say! Can
we have any earthly guaranty that they have been jo
king all these many years, and are in carnest now
Somebody is to be deceived: either they were playing
false to the one hundred thousand voters who followed
them into the support of Van Buren and Adams in 1848
or they are playing false to President Recovering the

them into the support of Van Buren and Adams in 1848, or they are playing failse to President Pierce and the Cinemnati Convention in 1856. Which is it?

Three-fourths of this Convention of the 19th January are men who were Van Burenites and Buffalo Platform men in 1848. They have been required to submit themselves to this personnal humiliation as the price of continued favor in the way of offices and patronage. The Washington Union and the wireprice of command have in the way of offices that patronage. The Washington Union and the wire-workers of the Custom-House puppets have demanded this as the price of toleration.

And yet it cannot be forgotten that the Convention of the 18th August, 18th, from whom this Convention of the 18th August, 18th, from whom this Convention of the 18th January certified as expenses, reafficient

the Wilmet Proviso as the "Cerner-Stone" of the Soft-Shell faith, and nominated a State ticket on which its author, Mr. John Van Buren—speaking "by authority"—truly said there was "only one man who "was not a supporter of Martin Van Buren in 1648. "They were proud of it then, and are prouder of it now."

The President of this Convention of the 16th January, too, it must not be forgotten, was the notorious W Riam H. Ludlow of Suffolk—the same man who now occasionally dines with the President at the White House, and dictates the decapitations and substitutions in our New-York Custom-House; the same who formerly made most rampant Abolition speeches, and who, when Speaker of the Assembly in 1833, left the chair and ran outside the bar of the House to avoid voting yea or nay on resolutions approving the Compromise Measures and Fugitive Slave Law of 1850; the same whose conduct at the Soft State Convention of 1854 Abijah Mann exposed with so ruthless a hand! But enough! this is the Pierce, Marcy and Van Buren party of the State of New-York! Let the actors in this grand hypocritical drama be marked and remembered. Let us treasure up their names in our recollections. The time may come when mothers will point them out to their children, and when men will remark as they pass them in the streets "There goes" a member of the Soft State Convention that ate dirt at Syracuse, on the 10th of January, 1856." The President of this Convention of the 10th Janua-

OHIO.

GOVERNOR CHASE'S INAUGURAL. After adverting at length to local topics, Gov-

rnor Chase proceeds as follows:

Your first and most carnest attention, gentlemen, doubtless be directed to the important matters within the immediate sphere of your legislative powers; but you cannot forget that you represent a sovereign State of the American Union, third of the thirty-one in wealth, and power, and population, and second to none in patriotic devotion to the welfare of the whole country. The appointment of a Senater to represent the State in one branch of the American Congress devolves upon you, and in making this appointment you will necessarily be required to consider the interests of Ohio as a Member of the Union.

Foremost among these interests is the presevation of the Union itself. Established by the wisdom of our fathers for the sublimest and noblest political ends, it descends to us a sacred trust. Under its benign influence our country has steadily advanced from strength to strength, and from greatness to greatness, extending her borders, enlarging her resources, and augmenting her power, until the name of American citizen has become a nobler distinction than was the name of Roman citizen in the proudest days of the mightiest republic of antiquity. To maintain the in-

mightiest republic of antiquity. To maintain the integrity of this Union; to defend the Constitution which is its bond; and to guard against all invasion from whatever quarter, those American Institutions which the Union and the Constitution secure to us, have ever been, and I trust will ever be, acknowledged as sucred obligations by the people of Ohio.

Cherishing these sentiments and ever prepared to give full proof of unwavering fidelity to them, it is not only our right but our duty to insist that the interests of Ohio shall be duly regarded in the administration of the General Government. Few States contribute so largely to the national revenues as our own. The people of Ohio have paid to the Federal Government or to its grantees, for the soil which they occupy and cultivate, more than \$30,000,000. Of the revenues derived from duties, we contribute necessarily in proportion to our numbers. As the population of our State is about one tenth of the entire population of the Union, we pay about one tenth of that revenue. Its entire amount for the last year exceeded \$60,000,000.

The proportion of Ohio was of course six millions.

While we have thus paid for the very soil we live on, an amount which no other people has ever paid under like circumstances or under any circumstances, and while we still contribute thus amply and freely to the annual revenue, it is not an agreeable reflection that, of all the States in which the General Government has asserted a proprietary right to the soil, Ohio has received the least in grants of lands for education, improvement, and other like purposes; and that while millions are expended for the protection and benefit of Commerce on the Ocean Coasts of the Republic, the property and lives of our own people are exposed to continual peril and enormous loss upon our Rivers and

Commerce on the Ocean Coasts of the Republe, the property and lives of our own people are exposed to continual peril and enormous loss upon our Rivers and our Lakes for the want of comparatively insignificant appropriations for the improvement of their channels and harbors. The injustice of unequal grants of lands is perhaps beyond remedy; but it will be our own fault if our Rivers and Harbors continue to be thus resolved.

is perhaps beyond redely, and a our of our own fault if our Rivers and Harbors continue to be thus neglected.

While in these and many other important details of administration the interests of our own State are deeply affected by the action of the National Government, we are even more vitally concerned in the great principle by which that action and the progressive development of our country are regulated and controlled. As man is more than his circumstances, as Freedom is better than wealth, as rights are more important than institutions, it becomes us to look well to the fundamental ideas which determine the character of government and the course of its practical operation.

The basis of American institutions is the democratic principle of equality among men. They rest upon the solid foundation of popular consent. The primary objects of their establishment are the defense and protection of personal rights. If they fail to secure these ends, it is the duty of the people who established to amend or change them. To organize and administer Government upon these principles is the true work of a recombining means the course of the proposition of a personal rights. Government upon these principles is the true work of a

basis of American Institutions, various exceptions, under the pressure of real or supposed exigencies, have been admitted to its universal application. Among these, Slavery, the creature of Despotism and the deadily opposite of Democracy, claims baleful pressure.

While the Democrane idea thus constitutes the

and political, were, however, well understood, and its

ery existed in all the States. He evil influences, social and political, were, however, well understood, and its irreconcilable antagonism to the rights of human nature and the principles of just government, was universally acknowledged.

The founders of the Republic, in framing our institutions, were careful to give no national sanction to this portentous anomaly, but they attempted no interference with its existence in the States. Outside of State limits they allowed it no shelter. Within State limits they left it to the exclusive disposition of States immediately concerned. No fact is better established by the records of the past than the prevalence, during the earlier period of our history, of an almost universal expectation that Slavery, excluded by positive prohibition from all national territory, would gradually but certainly, and at no distant day, under the operation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and through the action of the State authorities, disappear wholly from every State of the Union. The foremest champions of Freedom were citizens of Slave States, and occupied the highest stations in the State and Newton of States.

foremest champions of Freedom were catzens of Stave States, and occupied the highest stations in the State and National Governments.

In 1784, immediately after the partial adjustment of the conflict between the claims of the Union and the pretensions of the States in respect to the territory be-tween the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, through the tween the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, through the cession, by Virginia, of the territory north-west of the Ohio. Jefferson proposed to provide forever against the extension of Slavery, by a positive prohibition of its existence after 1800, in any territory ceded or to be ceded, or in any State to be created out of such territory. This proposed prohibition received the votes of sixteen out of twenty-three Delegates, and of six out of the Congress of the Confederation. It nine States in the Congress of the Confederation. It failed to become a law by reason of that provision of the Articles of Confederation which made the concurrence of at least seven States necessary to an affirmative decision of any question. The great majority in its favor indicates, however, the prevalent sentiment of the time.

Three ways later the Confinence of 1787 impressed.

Three years later, the Ordinance of 1787 impressed upon the soil of the territory north-west of the Ohio au indellible prohibition of Slavery. That Ordinance was adopted by the unanimous votes of all the States in Congress. It covered every inch of territory sub-ject to the exclusive regulation of the General Govern-

In the same year the National Constitution was framed. Mr. Madison declared it "wrong to admit in "the Constitution the idea that there could be prop-"erty in man." No such word as Siave or Siavery found place in any of its provisions. All recognition of the rightfulness of slaveholding, and all national sametion of the practice, was carefully excluded from the instrument. In every clause which has been, or can be construed as referring to Slavery, it is regarded as the creature of State legislation, and dependent wholly many State legislation for its existence and continuous upon State legislation for its existence and continu ance. There is no trace in the Constitution itself, o in the debates of its framers, of any expectation or ap

in the debates of its framers, of any expectation or apprehension of the institution or maintenance of Stavery by national law, or in national territory. No one anticipated its extension beyond the limits of the existing States.

But the people required additional scenrity. When, therefore, Virginia suggested an amendment of the Constitution, that "no preeman ought to be deprived "of his life, liberty or property but by the law of the "land." Congress refused to sanction this restricted guaranty, but proposed, for the adoption of the States, an amendment, embracing a comprehensive and express interdict against all invasion of personal rights. an amendment, embracing a comprehensive and ex-pressinterdict against all invasion of personal rights by the General Government. That interdict, made period the Complete on by the occupant of the States

is in these words: "No person shall be "deprived of life, liberty or property without due "process of law." So long as this provision remains unaftered, it is not easy to see how Slavery can be constitutionally introduced anywhere or continued anywhere by national legislation or in national territory.

national territory.

This brief statement will suffice to show what was This brief statement will suffice to show what was the policy and what was the anticipation of the founders of this Republic in respect to Slavery. Their policy was one of repression, limitation, discouragement; they anticipated with confidence the auspicious result of universal Freedom. Persistent adherence to their policy would doubtless have realized their anticipations.

I need not say to you that this policy has not been adhered to; nor need I trace the gradual process by which the Constitution has been wrested from its original purposes, and the Government has been converted into an instrument for the maintenance and extension of Slavery.

of Slavery.

By cossions from Slave States, and by treaties with

into an instrument for the maintenance and extension of Slavery.

By cessions from Slave States, and by treaties with foreign Governments, vast territories have been acquired, in all of which the original policy of the Government required prohibition, but to mone of which was prohibition actually applied, until resistance to the further increase of Slavery and the Slave Power in the Republic by the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, led to the great contest between the Extensionists and the Restrictionists, which, in 1820, terminated in the adjustment generally known as the Missouri Compromise.

The terms of that compromise were these: That Missouri should be admitted with Slavery; that Slavery should be forever prohibited in the Territory acquired from France, north of 36 deg. 30 min., except Missouri; and that Congress should refrain, for the present at least, from legislative prohibition of Slavery south of 36 deg. 30 min. This last term was only implied: it was not expressed.

This compromise, in substance and effect, was a compact between the slaveholding and non-laveholding sections of the country, and was universality so regarded. It yielded to Slavery absolutely the territory occupied by Missouri, and it feft without the protection of prohibition all the residue of territory acquired under the French Treaty, south of 30 deg. 30 min. As the original policy of the country, and the true principles of the Coustitution required the exclusion of Slavery from the whole of this territory, it was to be expected that this adjustment would be received with much dissatisfaction in the Free States. It was so received; but after a time, for the sake of peace, and in the full belief that its stipulations in respect to the territory north of 30 deg. 30 min. would be faithfully observed, the people generally acquired in it.

Concession invites aggression. Having succeeded in establishing Slavery in Missouri, the slave power soon insisted upon the implied term of the Compromise, was allotted to slaveholding Indian t proved illusory. When the time arrived for the organization of Government for this territory, with a view to open it for settlement and cultivation, the country was astounded by the demand of the Slave Power for the abrogation of the Missouri Prohibition. At first the demand was heard with incredulous amazement, and then with unavailing indignation. It availed nothing to appeal to plighted faith—nothing to appeal to ancient policy or Constitutional guaranties. The great dominant power of Slavery demanded the sacrifice of Freedom, and the oblation must be made. The Missouri Prohibition was repealed; the Compromise of 1820—performed to the letter, and far beyond the letter, by the Free States—was broken up and destroyed by the Slave States to avoid the fulfillment of its only stipulation in favor of Freedom.

The pretenses under which this wrong was perpendent

the letter, by the Free States—was broken up and destroyed by the Slave States to avoid the faliniment of its only stipulation in favor of Freedom.

The pretenses under which this wrong was perpetrated, give additional keenness to the sense of injury. It was boildy asserted that the prohibition was unconstitutional. The power to prohibit Territorial Slavery had been exercised by the first Congress under the Constitution in the act providing for continuing in full effect the Ordinance of 1787. The Constitution, in express terms, had conferred on Congress the power to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the territory of the United States. This provision had been uniformly regarded as authorizing all necessary Territorial legislation. Almost every President had approved its exercise. The very persons who denied the power to prohibit Slavery, asserted the power to establish Territorial Governments, and to define their departments and powers, and therefore, in denying the power of prohibition, were reduced to the necessity of denying that the greater includes the less.

Under these circumstances, after the prohibition had remained unquestioned for more than the third of a century, the denial of its constitutionality rather provoked indignation than excited doubt.

It was also insisted that the doctrine of popular sovereignty required the repeal of the prohibition. This was a mere abuse of terms. The true idea of popular sovereignty demands as a primary essential condition the recognition of inalienable personal rights. There can be no genuine popular sovereignty where a portion of the population is enalayed. The prohibition

condition the recognition of inalienable personal rights. There can be no genuine popular sovereignty where a portion of the population is enslaved. The probabition of Slavery is therefore a necessary prerequisite to a real sovereignty of the people. In the sense of the apologists for repeal, popular sovereignty signifies nothing but the right of a portion of the community to enslave the rest. It begins by the denial of the natural rights of man. It must end in the total subversion of the fandamental principles of American institutions. For a free and independent people, it would substitute a community of masters, dependents, and slaves.

Such is the repulsive theory. In practical operation it has not proved more attractive. As embodied in the Nebraska-Kansas bill, it has been fruitful of nothing but evil. It has not conferred a single substantial

ing but evil. It has not conferred a single substantial benefit upon the settlers of either Territory. In no respect are they distinguished from the settlers of Minnesota, where Slavery is prohibited, except by exposure to its evils. The sole special effect of the Newscare to the settlers of the Newscare to the Newsc nesota, where Slavery is prohibited, except by exposure to its evils. The sole special effect of the Nebraska-Kansas act upon the Territories organized under it is to open them to the introduction of slaves. In one of them it has led to desperate attempts to effect that object—to invasion, usurpation, violence, bloodshed—almost to civil war. Crimes like these are not the legitimate fruits of that doctrine of popular self-government to the maintenance of which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes and their konor. ionor.

In all these things our own State has a deep and pe-

culiar interest. Our own history furnishes the most complete vindication of the policy of Slavery prohibition. We occupy, in part, the soil protected from the blight of Slavery by the Ordinance of 1787. For more than half a century the people of Ohio have been accustomed to regard that ordinance with mingled emotions of gratitude, and pride. Comprisons of gratitude and pride. Comprisons a group is customed to regard that ordinance with mingled emo-tions of gratitude and pride. Conspicuous among its provisions and in fit companion-hip with its sacred guarantees of religious freedom, of liberality to-ward immigrants, of the inviolability of private con-tracts, of the security of private property, and of universal education, stands the great interdict against Slavery, acknowledging and impartially pro-tecting the rights of man as man. The words to which we always recur when seeking in the ordin-ance the peculiar springs of our wonderful proswhich we always recur when seeking in the ordinance the peculiar springs of our wonderful prosperity and progress are those which embody this prohibition. Never did the noble pioneers who laid the foundations on which we now joyfully build, complain of that interdict as an abridgement of any rights, personal or political. On the contrary they have ever spoken of it as the pillar of fire by night and the cloud by day which guided and protected them in the wilderness. More than any other State, Ohio, as its first-born of the Ordinance, and indebted to the Ordinance for her proud position as the third State of the Confederacy, and first among the new States, is bound to cherish and defend its great and beneficent principles. In so doing, we shall be fellow-workers with its illustrious frames in their own declared policy and purpose of "extending the fendamental principles of civil and religious liberty whereon these Republics, their laws and constitutions are creeted, and fixing and establishing those "principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions and principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions and governments which forever hereafter shall be formed in" American "territory."

No political duty appears to be more urgent than

The question of Slavery, it is almost universally con

The question of savery, it is almost universally conceded, transcends in present importance all other political questions of a national character. The repeal of the Missouri Prohibition, abrogating the Missouri Compromise, opens anew the whole subject of the relations of Slavery to the Union, to the States, and to the Territories. In determining the true line of duty, under these circumstances, it seems to be the part of wisdom to recur to the acts of the Founders of the Republic, and to the principles of the Polithum of the Republic, and to the principles of the Constitution. To me these guides seem to indicate a plain path. It leads back to the original national policy. That policy, I have already remarked, while it sametioned no cutsure interference with Slavery within Slave States,

contemplated no extension of it beyond State limits. It regarded Slavery in all its relations as subject, exclusively, to State legislation, and absolved the General Government from all responsibility for its extension or continuance. Our return to that policy should be signalized by the restoration of the guaranty of Freedom to the Territorics which have been deprived of it by the retrograde legislation of Congress. Had the policy originally adopted been persistently pursued, the question of Slavery would have ceased long since to vex our repose and disturb our councils. Should that policy be restored, may we not confidently expect the restoration also of those relations of harmony and good will which characterized the era of its adoption, and that through repeal of all national legislation in support of Slavery and the constitutional action of State Governments, the ardent desire of our fathers for the deliverance of the whole country from the great evil may at length be fulfilled? No worthier objects than these, in my judgment, can engage the united efforts of freemen. Frank and cordial co-operation for these noble ends excludes all invidious and unjust discrimination on account of birth or creed, endangers no right of any individual or any State, but promises the happy result of a more perfect Union, established upon the solid foundations of Exact Justice and Equal Rights.

I have thus submitted to you gentlemen, my general views upen several topics of public interest. Other important matters will doubtless engage your attention. You need no further assurance of my disposition to co-operate faithfully with you in whatever may promote the common welfare. Let us proceed then to the discharge of our respective duties. With hearts full of gratified to God for the liberty which we enloy, and the prosperity which has attended as hitherto, let it be our constant endeavor, looking reverently to the gradient of these who are to come after us, of the noble heritage of free institutions which we have received from our

and improved,

A CONGRESSIONAL CATECHISM.

The following is Mr. BANKs's reply to the questions of Mr. Zollicoffer, delivered in the House of Representatives on Saturday the 12th inst. Mr. Richardson had previously given his sentiments on the Goose ques-

Mr. Banks—Mr. Clerk, I voted for the resolutionpresented by the honorable gentleman from Tennessee
Mr. Zollicoffer, I vesterday, with pleasure. It embodics a principle which I think sound. As understood by
me, when reported at the Clerk's desk, it was nothing
more nor less than simply this: that any gentleman
who votes for a candidate for any office ought to know
the opinions of that candidate. I recognize the right
of every gentleman in this House who has been voting
for Speaker during this protracted contest, to ascertain the opinions of any man for whom he case his
vote. Sir, I should claim it as my right to know the
opinions of my candidate to such an extent as should
be satisfactory, to myself, at least.

But, Sir, as a member of the House, I have other
rights. I offer myself as a candidate for no office: I
solicit no man's suffrage; and I am not, therefore,
called upon as a candidate to selve such difficulties as
gentlemen supporting other persons may find in the existing condition of public affairs. Those who have
honored me by their confidence and votes are themselves responsible for the course they have chosen,
and, I doubt not, they are able to meet that responsibility. It is not for me to provide for their defense. I
can only say, as Othello said of his wife, they "had
eyes, and chose me."

I have convictions—convictions of duty, convictions
of principle—upon the great matters in which the courtry is interested; and, as a member of the House, re-Mr. BANKS-Mr. Clerk, I voted for the resolution

eyea, and chose me.

I have convictions—convictions of duty, convictions of principle—upon the great matters in which the country is interested; and, as a member of the House, representing a District in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I have no hesitation in responding to any of the inquiries propended by the honorable gentleman from Hennessee to the honorable gentleman from Hinois. I ask the Clerk to read the first question.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Am I right in supposing that the gentleman from Illine's regards the Kansa-Nebraska bill as promotive of the formation of Free States in the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska!"

Mr. Banks—It will be understood, of course, that the phraseology of this inquiry applies rather to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Richardson) than to myself. I suswer, distinctly, that I do not regard the Kansas-Nebraska bill as promotive of the formation of Free States, inasmuch as it repeals the prohibition of the Institution of Slavery over the section of country to which that statute applies. I think it does not tend to the formation of Free States. That is my answer.

The Clerk read as follows:

answer.
The Clerk read as follows:

answer.

The Clerk read as follows:

"An Irish in supposing he advocates the Constitutionality of the Wilmot Proviso; that in 1850 he apposed its application to the Territories acquired from Mexica, only upon the ground that it was unnecessary, inamuch as the Mexican itsel laws in those Territories already sholished Slavery—which ought to be sufficient for all Free Soil men; and that he committed himself to the position, that if Territoris bills (silent upon the subject of Slavery, and leaving the Mexican law to operate) were detested, he would vote for bills with the Wilmot Proviso in thom?

Mr. Basks—I could give a general answer in the affirmative to that interrogatory. I believe in the constitutionality of that act which is known and generally understood as the Wilmot Proviso. I believe that it is within the power of Congress to prohibit the institution of Slavery in a Territory belonging to the United States. Whether I would advocate the parage of such an act in regard to a Territory where it was clearly unnecessary, where by local, preexisting laws it had been prohibited; or, in other words, whether I would advocate a souble inhibition, I have only to say, that if a doubt existed as to its exclusion by valid municipal law, I should sustain an act which embodied the prohibition known as the Wilmot or Jefferson Proviso. In regard to the measures of 1850, I can only say, that, being called upon here or elsewhere, I should have voted for the prohibition in the Territories covered by those measures, if I had entertained a doubt as to the exclusion of Slavery by existing municipal law. That is my answer.

al law. That is my answer. The Clerk read as follows: Am I right in supposing that his theory is, that the Constitu-on of the United States does not carry Slavery to, and protect in, the Territories of the United States ?"

Mr. Banks—I do not believe that the Constitution

of the United States carries the institution of Slavery to the Territories of the United States. My under-standing is based on the declaration of Mr. Webster that even the Constitution of the United States itself that even the Constitution of the United States itself does not go to the Territories until it is carried there by an act of Congress. Standing on the principle of the English law governing the same interests, I do not believe that the Constitution of the United States carries to any Territory of the States any right to hold

laves there.
In order, Sir, that my answer should be full and sat-In order, Sir, that my answer should be full and satisfactory, I ought perhaps to put the negative of the proposition of the distinguished gentleman who leads the Government party on this floor and in this crisis. I recognize the right, Sir, to protection of property on the part of the South as well as on the part of the North in the Territories of the United States; and when I speak of property I mean that which is considered property by universal law; I do not mean that which is property only because it is held as such under the laws of a particular State, and which loses its character of property so soon as it extends beyond the limits of that State, except under certain reservations covered by the Constitution of the United States. the limits of that State, except under certain reservations covered by the Constitution of the United States.
When I speak of property I do not refer to that species. I describe that which is recognized as property
by universal laws of men, and not that which is property only when it is made such by local laws of limited
sections of the country. I have no disposition to disturb its existence—no purpose to diminish or increase
it there. I will acknowledge all its rights there, accepting for that purpose the charts established by
Southern statesmen; but I deny that it is such property as, independent of local law or Congressional enactment, is protected by the Constitution in the Territories of the United States.

I have nothing further to say on this very nice and
delicate question. I believe that the Constitution of

I have nothing further to say on this very mee and delicate question. I believe that the Constitution of the United States was intended to do justice to all sections of the country—to the South equally with the North. I am for that to-day; and I adopt the language of my friend (Mr. Richardson) who has always treated me with distinguished courtesy in all discussions on this subject, that we should do justice to the South as well as to the North. In no speech or declaration that has fallen from my lies so far as I can South as well as to the North. In no speech or declaration that has fallen from my lips, so far as I can remember it, have I ever expressed a different sentiment; but, Sir, I cannot shut out from my memory the great fact that the Constitution of the United States is an instrument of Freedom, contemplated as such by its framers, and interpreted as such by all men of the South and the North until within the last few years. It is a chart of Freedom, established to secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity giving liberty to the States to do what they shall think to be proper within their own localities, under such circumstances as to them shall seem to be right and Just, but claiming no right and conceding no right to Just, but claiming no right and conceding no right to them to carry their own peculiar institutions beyond the limitations conferred by the doctrine of the sov-

ereignty of States.

No. Sir! The Constitution of the United States is an No, Sir! The Constitution of the United States is an instrument, not of immediate, but of ultimate and universal Freedom. It was so contemplated by the great men who framed it, and the world has so regarded it. The national flag, that is its symbol, that makes the land over which it floats, in whatever quarter of the globe, so long as it covers an American citizen, American territory, is the banner of ultimate and universal Liberty—its white and red folds symbols of Revolutionary trials, of the crests of victory, and the blood of sacrifice. May its starry union forever stand as lustrous rifice. May its starry union forever stand as lustrous and imperishable as the golden fires of God's firmament! [great applause.] That is my answer to that

question.
The Clerk read as follows:
That in the territory acquired from Mexico and Ferrice the Old Kareas and Nebraska) the Moscuri Restriction was the Moscuri Restriction was